

REMARKSClaim Changes

Claim 34 is amended to correct a typographical error.

No amendment made is related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment is made for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant had argued herein that such amendment is made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references. Any remarks made herein with respect to a given claim or amendment is intended only in the context of that specific claim or amendment, and should not be applied to other claims, amendments, or aspects of Applicant's invention.

Objection to the Specification

The Office Action dated April 3, 2008 states “[T]he disclosure was objected to because of the following informalities: Paragraphs 0002 and 0003 appear to have been mistakenly included and should therefore be removed.” In response to the objection to the specification Applicant has amended the specification to remove paragraphs [0002]-[0003].

Objection to the Claims

In response to the objection to claims 34 for informalities, Applicant has amended claim 34 by adding a terminating period.

Rejection of claims 1, 3, 5-14, 16-23, 31-37, and 40-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,475,826 (Fischer)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1, 3, 5-14, 16-23, 31-37, and 40-43. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully submits that Fisher does not anticipate, either expressly or inherently, each and every element as set forth in independent claims 1 and 23. For example, independent claim 1 recites “calculating a revised hash value... while calculating a check hash value for said N information block; then comparing said check hash value with said initial hash value” which is not anticipated either expressly or inherently, in Fischer. Similarly, independent claim 23 recites “calculating a second hash key for said revised block of data, wherein said

revised block of data immediately prior to being revised corresponds to a first hash key and wherein said first hash key is one of said hash keys for said plurality of blocks of data; utilizing said stored hash keys, including said first hash key, to calculate a check root key while utilizing said stored hash keys and said second hash key substituted in place of said first hash key to calculate a new root key; comparing said check root key with said initial root key” which is not anticipated either expressly or inherently, in Fischer.

Fisher is directed to a method for protecting a volatile file using a single hash by permitting hash of a file to be taken on incremental basis. Fischer describes Fisher “[W]hen a record identified by K_i is updated (where R_i is the old record and R_{2i} is the new record value), then the new revised database File hash is recomputed as: $\text{fileHash} = F(\text{FInv}(\text{fileHash}, H(K_i \& R_i)), H(K_i \& R_{2i}))$ In other words, the hash of the former record is removed and the newly computed hash value is inserted. If a record identified by ‘ K_i ’ is removed from the data base, database File hash is revised to: $\text{fileHash} = \text{FInv}(\text{fileHash}, H(K_i \& R_i))$. If a new record identified by K_i is introduced, then the revised hash becomes: $\text{fileHash} = F(\text{fileHash}, H(K_i \& R_i))$. With this protocol, the revised hash can be computed as modified and stored.” See Fischer, col. 8, lines 39-57.” Fisher further describes “[I]n block 1420, the value R_n of the record identified by K_n is read and decrypted as necessary. The computedHash is then augmented with the new record R_n , by computing: $\text{computed Hash} = F(\text{computedHash}, \text{Hash}, ((\text{length of } K_n) \| K_n \| R_n))$... a check is made at block 1430 to determine whether the new ‘filehash’ is equal to the ‘computedHash’ if the hashes match the database file is valid....” See Fischer, FIG. 2 and col. 10, line 54 to col. 11, line 2. Therefore, in Fischer a new fileHash is compared to the computedHash wherein the computedHash is computed after replacing the old record with the updated record. See Fischer FIG. 2, blocks 1070, 1090, 1110, 1200, and 1430. Thus, Fisher does not disclose or suggest comparing the initial hash value to a check hash value, wherein the check hash value is also calculated on the original, unaltered information block, as required by Applicant’s independent claims 1 and 23.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Fischer does not disclose “calculating a revised hash value... while calculating a check hash value for said N information block; then comparing said check hash value with said initial hash value” and “calculating a second hash key for said revised block of data, wherein said revised block of data immediately prior to being revised corresponds to a first hash key and wherein said first hash key is one of

said hash keys for said plurality of blocks of data; utilizing said stored hash keys, including said first hash key, to calculate a check root key while utilizing said stored hash keys and said second hash key substituted in place of said first hash key to calculate a new root key; comparing said check root key with said initial root key” as recited by independent claims 1 and 23. Applicant therefore submits that independent claims 1 and 23 are not anticipated by Fischer, and therefore the rejection of claims 1 and 23 under 35 USC 102(b) should be withdrawn. Applicant requests that claims 1 and 23 may now be passed to allowance.

Dependent claims 3, 5-14, 16-22, 31-37, and 40-43 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 23. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of dependent claims 3, 5-14, 16-22, 31-37, and 40-43 and requests the withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection of Claims 2, 4, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over US 5,475,826 (Fischer)

Applicant submits that dependent claims 2, 4, and 24 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 23, which are deemed to be allowable in view of reason described above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of dependent claims 2, 4, and 24 and requests the withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection of Claims 15, 28-30, and 38-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over US 5,475,826 (Fischer) and further in view of US 5,754,659 (Sprunk)

Applicant submits that dependent claims 15, 28-30, and 38-39 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 23, which are deemed to be allowable in view of reason described above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of dependent claims 15, 28-30, and 38-39 and requests the withdrawal of the rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant has reviewed the other references of record and believes that Applicant's claimed invention is patentably distinct and nonobvious over each reference taken alone or in combination. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicant. Should the Examiner have any

questions, comments, or suggestions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney or agent at the telephone number indicated below.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Date: July 28, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Larry T. Cullen/
Larry T. Cullen
Reg. No.: 44,489

Motorola Connected Home Solutions
101 Tournament Drive
Horsham, PA 19044
(215) 323-1797